

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 STATE 065068

12

ORIGIN SS-10

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 /011 R

66664

DRAFTED BY: PM/ DCA: TWSIMONS, JR.,

- APPROVED BY: D/ MBFR: MR. BAKER

S/ S- O: R. WRIGHT

----- 006080

R 070347 Z APR 73

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION NATO

S E C R E T STATE 065068

EXDIS

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

FOLL SENT CTION SECSTAE INFO SECDEF FROM VIENNA 02 APR 73 REPEATED  
TO YOU QUOTE

S E C R E T VIENNA 2633

EXDIS

NOFORN

FROM US MBFR REP

EO: 11652 GDS

TOGS: PARM

SUBJ: MBFR: APRIL 1 DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REP ON HUNGARIAN ISSUE

REF: VIENNA 2621

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. US REP MET WITH SOVIET REP KVITSINSKIY AT 1100  
HOURS LOCAL TIME, SUNDAY, APRIL 1. US REP TOOK LINE SET FORTH IN  
PARA 14 OF REFTEL. KVITSINSKIY SAID HIS INITIAL REACTION WAS THAT  
TO ADD THE PHRASE " ABOUT FORCES AND TERRITORY IN CENTRAL EUROPE"

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 065068

TO THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WOULD PRECLUDE SOVIETS FROM DISCUSSING ITALY IF AND WHEN THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE WERE RAISED IN NEGOTIATIONS. FOR THIS REASONS, HE DOUBTED ITS ACCEPTABILITY. REGARDING UNILATERAL STATEMENTS, KVITSINSKIY SAID HE THOUGHT THE EAST WOULD WISH TO MAKE A REPLY TO THE EFFECT THAT THE WESTERN STATEMENT WAS NOT BINDING. US REP OBJECTED THIS WOULD DEPRIVE STATEMENTS OF THEIR VALUE. KVITSINSKIY AGAIN RAISED QUESTION OF NOMENCLATURE OF FRG. KVITSINSKIY SAID HE WOULD REPORT CONVERSATION TO MOSCOW THAT DAY AND HOPE FOR NEW INSTRUCTIONS BY THE EVENING OF APRIL 2. END SUMMARY.

2. US REP MET WITH SOVIET REP KVITSINSKIY AT 1100 HOURS LOCAL TIME, APRIL 1 ( STATE 59982 NOT RECEIVED HERE UNTIL 1058 LOCAL TIME). US REP TOLD KVITSINSKIY HE HAD REPORTED HIS REMARKS OF MARCH 30 TOGETHER WITH THE SUGGESTED SOVIET TEXT TO THE DEPARTMENT. AS HE READ THE SITUATION IN THE DEPARTMENT, HE DID NOT BELIEVE THE LATTER WOULD WISH TO CONSIDER A SOLUTION WHICH DID NOT LEAVE OPEN THE POSSIBLE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY FOR LATER DECISION, WHICH CONTAINED AN ENLARGEMENT CLAUSE WHICH IN ITS PRESENT FORMULATION MAINLY SERVED SOVIET INTERESTS, AND WHICH MADE NO PROVISION FOR TREATMENT OF THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE IN A NEUTRAL WAY. HE BELIEVED THIS SITUATION MIGHT BE CHANGED IF THE SOVIETS WERE WILLING TO ACCEPT INCLUSION IN THE TEXT OF A POSSIBLE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA OF THE PHRASE " WITH FORCES OR TERRITORY IN CENTRAL EUROPE" AFTER THE PHRASE " IF ANOTHER STATE" AND ALSO TO AGREE THAT THERE SHOULD EITHER BE AN AGREED STATEMENT ON HUNGARY OR AN UNCONTESTED ALLIED STATEMENT ALONG THE LINES OF THE SECOND AND FOURTH CONCEPTS ADVANCED BY THE ALLIED REPS ON MARCH 28. US REP SAID HE THOUGHT ALLIES WOULD BE WILLING TO DISCUSS THE LANGUAGE OF SUCH STATEMENTS AND MAKE POSSIBLE CHANGES, AS LONG AS THEIR MAIN LINES WERE PRESERVED. HE SAID THAT IN VIEW OF THE SENSITIVITIES SHOWN BY THE HUNGARIANS, IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE TO CONSIDER CUTTING BACK SOMWHAT ON THE FORMULATION OF THE SUGGESTED HUNGARIAN STATEMENT WHILE PRESERVING ITS MAIN LINES. AS REGARDS OTHER ASPECTS OF THE SOVIET PAPER, HE WOULD RETURN TO THEM AT A LATER POINT. HE MERELY WISHED TO NOTE AT THIS POINT THAT HE HAD SOME QUESTION ABOUT THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LAST SENTENCE OF THE PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT FORMULA.

3. AFTER EXAMINING THE SUGGESTED ADDITION TO THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, WHICH HE HAD WRITTEN INTO THE SOVIET TEXT OF THE PROCEDURES PAPER, KVITSINSKIY SAID HE DID NOT THINK THIS FORMULA WOULD PROVE VERY ATTRACTIVE. IT WOULD PREVENT THE EAST FROM RAISING THE QUESTION.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 STATE 065068

TION OF ITALY DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS IF THE ALLIES RAISED THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE. IT COULD ONLY BE CONSIDERED, HE THOUGHT, IF THE PHRASE READ, " WITH FORCES OR TERRITORY IN THE STRATEGIC AREA OF CENTRAL EUROPE," WHICH IN THE SOVIET DEFINITION WOULD INCLUDE ITALY. US REP SAID SOVIETS SHOULD NOT ASK FOR TOO MUCH. IF THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA THEY HAD PROPOSED WERE TO BE FURTHER CONSIDERED, IT WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF ESTABLISHING THREE BARRIERS AGAINST ARBITRARY TREATMENT OF THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE WHICH SHOULD PROVIDE FULL PROTECTION TO EASTERN INTERESTS: THE DECISION TO BRING IN HUNGARY WOULD HAVE TO BE BY CONSENSUS; IT WOULD HAVE TO BE AT THE DESIRE OF HUNGARY; AND THE SOVIETS COULD ALSO ARGUE ON THE BASIS OF PREJUDICING THEIR SECURITY IF THIS SENTENCE WERE RETAINED IN ITS PRESENT FORM. KVITSINSKIY REPEATED THAT HE DID NOT THINK THE FORMULA WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE. US REP SAID HE SHOULD NONETHELESS SUBMIT IT FOR CONSIDERATION.

4. KVITSINSKIY SAID AS HE UNDERSTOOD THE MOSCOW VIEWPOINT, IT DID NOT APPROVE USING EXCHANGES OF STATEMENTS OR AN UNCONTESTED WESTERN STATEMENT. IF IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, THERE WERE TO BE A WESTERN STATEMENT, THERE WOULD POSSIBLY HAVE TO BE AN EASTERN STATEMENT WHICH SAID THE WESTERN STATEMENT WAS NOT BINDING. US REP SAID ANY STATEMENTS THAT MIGHT BE MADE WOULD LOOSE THEIR EFFECT IF THEY WERE CONTESTED. HE DID NOT AT THIS TIME SEE ANY POSSIBILITY OF AN OUTCOME UNLESS HIS SUGGESTIONS WERE SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED AND ACTED UPON.

5. KVITSINSKIY RAISED THE QUESTION OF NOMENCLATURE OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY IN THE LIST OF PARTICIPANTS. HE SAID SOVIET EMBASSY HELSINKI HAD REPORTED THAT THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY WAS LISTED UNDER THE FRENCH ALPHABET AS " REPUBLIQUE FEDERAL D' ALLEMANDE." NEITHER WAS LISTED WITH THE WORD FOR GERMANY FIRST. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES ATTACHED IMPORTANCE TO THIS MATTER AND INSISTED THAT THE VIENNA TALKS NOT BE USED TO LAUNCH A NEW FEDERAL GERMAN EFFORT TO CLAIM STATUS WHICH IT DID NOT POSSESS. US REP SAID HIS UNDERSTANDING OF THE HELSINKI PROCEDURE  
E E E E E E E

\*\*\* Current Handling Restrictions \*\*\* EXDIS

\*\*\* Current Classification \*\*\* SECRET

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:**  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 07 APR 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973STATE065068  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** PM/ DCA: TWSIMONS, JR.,  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** RR  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** SECSTATE WASHDC  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19730436/aaaahvdj.tel  
**Line Count:** 150  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** ORIGIN SS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS, NOFORN  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS, NOFORN  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:** ANOMALY  
**Review Date:** 03 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <03-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <17-Sep-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 971205  
**Subject:** N/A  
**TAGS:** PARM, TO, NATO  
**To:** NATO  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005